UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Tulsa!

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Sociology of Peace

By ELLSWORTH FARIS

Joseph Mazzini

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 16

Chicago, June 16, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 243
Tulsa!—John Haynes Holmes 245

CONTRIBUTED—

The Sociology of Peace.—Ellsworth Faris 248
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. IV. Joseph Mazzini.—George Willis Cooke 251

A BOOK A WEEK—

Mary Badollet Powell Memorial. "Miss Lulu Bett."—James Waldo Fawcett 253

POETRY—

Peace Over Earth.—*Edwin Markham* 243
Memories.—*Marya Zaturensky* 248
Eternal Spring.—Lily O. Wilson 251

THE FIELD—

The Quakers in Germany 255

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1921 NUMBER 16

PEACE OVER EARTH.

Blow, bugles, blow!
The battle years have ended, and we go
Onward to meet the future with a song,
Knowing our might is greater than all wrong—
Knowing we have a key for every gate
And that the heart has dare for every fate—
Knowing that God is in the years ahead,
As He was with us when the roads were red.

Blow, bugles, blow!
The shames and tyrannies begin to go,
Sing, bugles, sing into the ears of time
The end of the ancient crime—
Sing with a silver tongue,
Let all old faces gladden and grow young,
And let the hearts of youth
Sing with the glory of the world's New Truth—
The high glad brother hail;
For nevermore must Love's great purpose fail—
Never again the hopes depart
Out of the world's joy-stilled, grief-greatened heart

* * * * * * *

O, let us gather as friends and say,
"Come, let us try the Master's way.
Ages we tried the way of swords,
And earth is weary of hostile hordes.
Comrades, read out His words again:
They are the only hope for men!
Love and not hate must come to birth;
Christ and not Cain must rule the Earth."

—*Edwin Markham.*

For The Churchman Peace Number.

"I have just been reading anew," said Charles William Eliot, in a recent address, "Channing's great sermon at Baltimore. It was an hour and a half of intense religious controversy, and he expressed himself with utmost freedom, and *he did not care how many men took his advice or how many opposed the opinions he advocated.*" Here is an admirable statement of the spirit which should properly control all persons whose business it is to express opinions. This is the rule of life for the editor and for the preacher, in political and economic controversy as well as in religious controversy, in time alike of war and of peace. Certainly it is the standard which humbly and hopefully we set before ourselves in the editorial direction of UNITY. We esteem it our duty to state what we think on the questions we discuss in these columns, "with the utmost freedom"; and to be utterly indifferent as to how many or how few of our readers take our "advice," or "oppose the opinions (we) advocate." Our concern is not with our readers—although of course we always cherish the dream of persuading them to the sweet reasonableness of our position!—but with ourselves. To make these columns a sacred confessional, where we may speak all that is in our minds, without fear or favor of any reader, subscriber, trustee, censor—this is the obligation imposed upon us, the ideal set before us. Most of our friends understand this. We fondly wish that they all did!

Now at last we know what President Wilson and his Palmers and Burlesons were doing to this country during the war period! An expert has spoken on the question, and controversy is at an end. Listen to what Marshal Von Hindenburg has to say in his recent book, "Out of My Life"! Speaking of America's war effort, the distinguished German general states:

> Under compulsion of military necessity, a ruthless autocracy was at work, *and rightly*, even in this land at the portals of which the Statue of Liberty flashes its blinding light across the seas. They understood war. Weaker voices had to be silent until the hard task was done. Only then might the spirit of freedom make itself heard for the good of humanity. For the time being it must be silenced for the good of the State.

The meaning of this testimony is perfectly plain. What the Wilson administration did here at home during the war has the hearty approval of the iron-fisted German soldier who knows what autocracy is, practiced it ruthlessly and believes in it absolutely. What the American President did, in other words, was exactly what Hindenburg would have done in his place—and incidentally what the Kaiser was doing in Germany all the time! Such testimony from such a source is ghastly stuff; but it is refreshing, none the less. For ourselves, we prefer tyranny naked and unashamed, to tyranny piously garbed in the cloak of "the new freedom." Even as slaves, we then breathe an atmosphere that is at least clean and honest.

It is announced by Whitney Warren, the famous American architect, that his plans for the reconstruction of the library at Louvain have been accepted and that work will begin in the summer. The new building will follow Flemish models of the 17th Century, will stand not on the former site but in the center of the city, and will bear on its facade in gigantic lettering a Latin inscription which reads in translation, "Destroyed by German Hate and Restored by Americans." We count it a happy circumstance that this inscription is to be written in Latin, for the passing of this ancient tongue will soon make it unintelligible to any but scholars. Even so, it seems to us a tragedy that this beautiful enterprise of restoration, so nobly carried through by American generosity and idealism, should be marred by such an instance of vengeance and cherished hate as this embodied in the proposed inscription. Is the vision of Mr. Whitney and his collabora-

tors so dim that they cannot see the time when men will gladly forget the hatreds of this day, as they have forgotten the hatreds of other days? Are the hearts of Mr. Whitney and his collaborators so small that they cannot understand that generosity is only marred by linking it "with the burden of an ancient grudge," to quote the admirable comment of the *New York World*. Suppose that when our fathers rebuilt the White House in Washington, after it had been looted and burned by the British troops in the War of 1812, they had inscribed over its entrance portal, the words, "Destroyed by English hate and restored by Americans." Would we be proud of that inscription today? Indeed, would it not have long since been removed as a defamation of the noble instincts of our fathers' lives and a distortion of the best ideals of our modern day? We trust that wise second thought will change this plan in this particular. We quote the *World* again,

> If the enmities of the late war are to be inscribed in the edifices which rise from the ashes, it is waste labor to reconstruct them. They will bear in themselves the seeds of a second ruin.

The Bolsheviki are apparently very terrible people. They imprison and murder, violate contracts and confiscate property. It is simply impossible to have any dealings with such monsters of iniquity. So at least says Washington! But has anybody noticed that there is one group of persons who seem to get along very nicely with the Bolsheviki—who make no sacrifice of their own independence, and yet suffer none of the inconveniences and outrages that seem to fall so indiscriminately upon everybody else? We refer, of course, to the Quakers, who go to the starving and disease-infected areas of Russia, as during the war they went to the battlefields of Flanders, and find themselves immune from all the dread experiences which are the fate of other men. These ministers of mercy are unmolested by the Soviet authorities; they are allowed to go where they will, and do what they want, in their endeavors to feed the starving, heal the sick and console the dying; they make contracts with, and exact promises from, the government, which are invariably kept by the government's representatives. The Quakers find, in other words, that the Bolsheviki are quite as human and humane as other people, and that relations with them are quite as safe. Of course, it may be argued that the Quakers are busy only with good works, and that there is no reason why the commissars should not co-operate with them on terms of amity and mutual confidence. But it is just this contention which proves our point—that all persons, even Bolsheviki, can be trusted if they are approached as friends and not as enemies, and if relations are frankly joined to ends of service, and in the spirit of love one for another!

The text for our disarmament editorial this week is the simple little item that a modern battleship these days costs no less than forty million ($40,000,000) dollars. *Forty millions* for a ship that can be pounded to pieces in a night upon a storm-swept reef, that can be blown to atoms in an instant by a well-placed mine or torpedo, that if not destroyed, must be relegated in twenty years in the scrap-heap as a worn out or antiquated piece of mechanism! And six of these silly toys are now in process of construction in this alleged enlightened country of America! What could not be done with these wasted funds? The oldest university in this country, after nearly three hundred years of existence, represents an investment of scarcely more than half the cost of one of these great ships. The greatest medical center ever projected by the mind of man—that recently announced by Columbia University and the Presbyterian Hospital in New York— involves an expenditure all told of much less than one-half the cost of one of these floating fortresses. One-tenth the sum appropriated each year for Negro education in the South, or the removal of slum conditions in the North, would change the face of the nation. Are we crazy that we thus fling to worse than useless purposes our hard-won wealth? We *are!*

Why are the churches ineffective? Why is organized religion today rightly held in contempt of men? Perhaps something of an answer can be found in what happened in New York City on Sunday, June 5. This was the date set aside as Disarmament Sunday by the great central bodies of the Protestants, Catholics and Jews of the United States. An appeal, addressed to ministers and rabbis everywhere, had urged that a sermon on behalf of disarmament he preached on this day in every pulpit in the land; and called specific attention to the statement of General Tasker H. Bliss that, if this were done, the task of disarmament could be effectually started *now*. How did the churches respond to this appeal? The Community Church had already had a Disarmament Sunday two months earlier; nevertheless, it announced the theme again in a sermon by Dr. Randall on "Disarmament or 'The Next War.'" In addition to this church, only two other churches among the many which advertise their services in the Saturday newspapers, gave attention to this critical problem. Some of the other subjects announced for this Disarmament Sunday were "The Savior's Cup," "Is There an Eternal Hell?" "The Singing Christ," "When Jesus Went to the Mountains," "Curing Comfort," "Three Men Whom Jesus Excused," "The Host's Table Talk," "Unrecognized Blessings," "The Cause and Cure of Radicalism," "Folded Hands," "My Soul Thirsteth for God," "Why Unitarians Believe in Character," "Life Abiding," "The Meaning of Baca," and "Hide and Seek." It is

evident that most ministers endorse the theme of still another sermon announced for this day on "The Grace of Silence." And yet how many of these men were silent when the call was for sermons not for disarmament, but for bloodshed and slaughter?

We are often blamed for laying so much emphasis in these columns on the decline of the churches. We wonder, however, if the fault is really ours. Why should the facts in the case not be made to carry some of the responsibility for the pessimism we express? If our churches are prospering these days, we are certainly recreant to the truth in declaring that the situation in the world of Protestantism is desperate. But what if the churches are not prospering, and the situation really desperate? *The Christian Register* is one of the most optimistic of religious journals. But here in a recent issue of this paper we find the following statement: "The country church problem is growing more and more acute. Churches in rural districts are closing, and larger and larger territories are passing from under the influence of religion. Persons in country districts are learning to do without the church, substituting civic improvement leagues, agricultural clubs, community centers and recreation programs." When *The Register* speaks thus, we can be sure that the situation is at least as bad as thus described and perhaps a good deal worse. The rural church situation has for years been alarming; and today the situation in towns and cities is almost as bad. Why disguise the facts or ignore them? Why not set them down in order, so that we may understand what is going on and find the remedy? *The Register* thinks that "the solution is for the church itself to offer an adequate community program." This is good as far as it goes; but why not apply a thorough-going remedy by urging the church itself to become a community institution? This is UNITY's program of reform. We present from week to week the evidence of the disintegration of the Protestant churches and the program of the Community Church movement, in order that a disease which is destroying religion may be stamped out, and religion thereby saved.

The Community Churchman, the new quarterly established to serve the interests of the community church movement, has made announcement, as we stated in our issue for April 21st, that there are not less than four hundred (400) community churches in the country today. We do not know where or how these figures have been obtained—they seem large to us! They probably have their origin in the fact that the editor counts as community churches three distinct types of religious organization which he calls "the federated church," "the union church" and "the denominational community church." Not all of these seem to us to be true types. And yet in this age of break-up and reconstruction, these churches are undoubtedly a definite development from old to new, and may therefore be accepted as positive steps in the evolution of community religion. Uniform in all of these institutions are at least two essential features—revolt from denominationalism, and recognition of the social aspects of religious life. Apart from questions of definition and type, and infinitely more important, is the fact that the movement *away* from existing churches is now in full swing, and a new church in definite process of formation. For the present, indeed for a long time to come, the situation in the religious field is certain to be highly confusing. More and more, however, as time goes on, it will clarify, and steadily in the direction, we believe, of the community church.

Tulsa!

The Tulsa massacre adds one more chapter of horror to the already sufficiently terrible tale of race riots in the United States. No words of description, denunciation or appeal remain to apply to this latest event, for all such words have long since been exhausted. Everything that could be said at such a time was said when Washington, Chicago and East St. Louis were red with the blood of Negroes. On the other hand, however, this Oklahoma outrage brings into sharp relief certain new phases of the Negro problem today, which call for comment and investigation. Without any question we are entering a new era of race relations in America, the elements of which will be ignored or defied at our peril.

(1) First of all to be noted is the fact that the rise of the Negro in the economic and social scale serves only to complicate and not to solve the problem of his relations with the whites. The more industrious, efficient and successful he is in the business world, the more insecure is his position in the community, and the more in hazard his own personal safety. This, of course, is just the opposite of what has been anticipated and definitely taught by whites and blacks alike for many years in the past. The whole movement for the industrial education of the Negro, which had the heroic leadership of such men as General Armstrong and Booker T. Washington, which is glorified in such institutions as Hampton and Tuskegee, and which has held the confident support of tens of thousands of whites both North and South, was based upon the one idea that all the Negro had to do, in order to gain the recognition which he sought and deserved, was to establish himself and his race upon a firm economic foundation. To be good farmers and workmen, to save money and accumulate property, to become prosperous and useful citizens in the community, this was all the colored people needed not only to end discrimi-

nation, but also to win cordial respect and admiration. If the Negro brings to market better sweet potatoes than his white neighbor, said Mr. Washington in innumerable public speeches, he will get the sale and hold the market, for money knows no color line! Thus for years, to quote the New York *Evening Post,* "have the best friends of the Negro advised him that his future and security lie in the development of his own economic and cultural resources. As the Negro prospered, it was believed that the points of social friction with his white neighbors would be reduced. But," continues the *Post,* "that cheerful belief is now hard to maintain. If the Negro worker's increasing prosperity is only to bring upon him the jealousy of the white worker, and if the rise of prosperous Negro communities is to breed new economic jealousies and hatreds, we are evidently face to face with a new difficulty."

It is this "new difficulty" which is written all over the Tulsa horror. Thus, according to the statement of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "the Negroes of the Black Belt of Oklahoma, of which Tulsa is the center, are probably the most cultured and prosperous body of Negro people in the country, judging by race standards." The Negro community in Tulsa itself, which represented a high degree of racial segregation—just what the Southern negrophobist, by the way, claims most to want!—was a neighborhood of happy prosperity and exemplary social discipline. Here were excellent homes, successful business houses, Negro churches, banks, theatres, etc., all embodying the best standards of the common life. But these facts offered no protection from outrage and destruction! On the contrary, it was this high-class model "ghetto" which was surrounded by circling automobiles on the night of the riot, swept by machine-gun and rifle fire, and at last burned flat to the ground by the conflagration kindled by the maddened whites.

Furthermore, all reports which have come to us from Oklahoma agree in stressing economic conditions as lying at the root of the Tulsa outbreak. Thus, many of the Negroes have shared in the abounding prosperity of the oil industry; some of them "have actually become owners of oil wells and have made neat sums." This has led to a deliberate campaign against the Negroes by whites who hold oil properties or make profits out of oil. Secretary Johnson, of the N. A. A. C. P., cites instances where Negroes have discovered oil on their land, and, because no white man would bore for them, have been obliged to sell at the white man's price. A Mrs. Harris, a refugee from Tulsa, tells of a Negro family which discovered oil on their property at Clearview, not far from Tulsa. When the white neighbors heard of the "strike" they demanded that the Negroes sell their farm to them. The colored family of five refused the demand, wishing to exploit the oil well for their own benefit. The whites persisted in their demand, and the Negroes in their refusal. A few nights later, the whole family was burned to death in their home!

This brings to mind an instance cited by Governor Dorsey, in his famous report covering the Georgia situation, of a prosperous Negro farmer who was assaulted, his family dispersed, he himself later convicted and sentenced to the chain-gang on a trumped-up charge, his farm sold at forced auction, and all the results of a lifetime of toil and sacrifice thus destroyed. Negroes in America today, like Jews in Russia in the days of the "Black Hundred," must be set aside for massacre if they become too prosperous!

Another economic aspect of the Tulsa horror is that presented by the unemployment recently prevailing. The slump in cotton threw large numbers of white and colored workers out of their "jobs," particularly on the farms. This led, of course, to a surplus of labor; and this, in turn, to resentment against the Negroes. Reports indicate that, for some time past, the whites in Oklahoma have been posting notices on fences and the walls of houses, and printing them in the newspapers, warning the Negro workers to get out of the State or "take the consequences." The prosperity of many Negroes at such a time of depression, had also led to a fresh assertion of the old demand that "the niggers be kept in their place." Everywhere were indications of a concerted effort to terrorize the colored population, so that they would be willing victims of exploitation.

What this means, from the standpoint of the general aspects of the Negro problem, is evident. For years it has been the stock-in-trade of the South that the Negro is essentially lazy, shiftless and vicious, an inferior creature incapable of rising and taking his equal place in the social group. The answer to this slander has been the determination of the Negro to "make good," especially in the economic field, and a success in this endeavor which may well be said to constitute the eighth wonder of the world. Now, with this achievement to his credit, the Negro finds himself worse off than ever. His white neighbor fears him as a competitor, is jealous of his prosperity, is embittered by his triumph in the face of enormous difficulties. A great wave of hatred sweeps the country wherever the Negro develops communities which are powerful and happy; always there appears the steady drive to force the Negro back into economic servitude, and every now and then a mad flare up of bloody passion, with the hideous accompaniments of looting, slaying and burning. What an *impasse* for the colored man! If he does not rise, he is no good; if he *does* rise, he is *too* good. There is no darker tragedy in American life today than the ending of fifty years of

unexampled industrial progress by the Negro in the race riots of Washington, Chicago and Tulsa.

(2) A second factor to be taken into account in the new race problem of the present hour, is the changed attitude of the Negro toward the whole question of his social status. In the past, the colored people have been on the whole a docile and submissive race. Naturally gentle, trustful and good-natured, the long experience of slavery has early trained them to an easy acceptance of the disabilities of their lot. In recent years, however, new forces steadily at work, have wrought a transformation which makes the Negro today a different man from what he has ever been before. Booker Washington's constant preaching of the gospel of racial self-respect has had spiritual consequences seldom visualized even by those who supported most generously its practical application in terms of industrial education. Dr. Du Bois's unflinching campaign through many years for the assertion of Negro rights has made irresistible appeal to thousands of the best young men and women of the race, who have now grown to maturity and become the leaders of their people. Most important has been the psychological reaction of the Negro's economic and social development. Inevitably as he has raised his economic status in the community, accumulated property, earned wealth and enjoyed its power, he has gained enormously in self-confidence and self-respect. Discriminations and indignities which were once accepted as a part of life, have now become intolerable. No longer is he ready to accept, without protest or resistance, the harsh and cruel treatment which has been the lot of his people from the beginning. Today he is a man, and he proposes to be treated as a man!

The climax of this development, of course, came with the Great War. This date marks an epoch in the evolution of the Negro race in America, second only to the great date, 1865. All at once, after a half-century of discrimination and persecution, the black man was lifted to a high degree of individual and social power. Through military conscription, through industrial regimentation, through the whole lift and sweep of patriotic idealism, he was initiated into the full dignity of citizenship, in so far, at least, as this dignity involved duties and responsibilities. Side by side with the white man, he drilled and marched and fought, he worked on ship construction and toiled in ammunition factories, he bought Liberty Bonds, contributed to the Red Cross and observed food regulations. In a movement nation-wide, under the stress of events cataclysmic in character, the Negro found himself caught up into the surging life of embattled America, and accepted for the first time as a full-fledged member of the national family. This meant pride, responsibility, sacrifice—a heightened dignity of manhood and a deepened sense of fellowship; and it meant also, for the blacks at least, a demand, at first wistful, then determined, and at last challenging, for a full share in the nation's opportunities and rewards. And it is just this one and final thing, so naively expected and so earnestly asked, which has been denied. The nation imposed upon the Negro during the war responsibilities, and now, after the war, frustration! The Negro is conscious, as he has never been before, of denial and outrage. For the first time in his life, he knows what he has done and what he deserves, and counts his exclusion therefore no longer as a doom but as a crime!

It is these things—and others less important—which have changed the attitude of the American Negro toward his own problem. A new black man stands before us. His gentleness and good-nature are still present; but gone forever is his subserviency. He now demands rights as well as accepts duties. He speaks in new and more militant tones, as witness the *Messenger* and the *Challenger*. Above all, he shows a tendency to fight back, and not merely run away. What this means to Negro manhood in particular and to American citizenship in general, is evident. But we doubt if it is equally evident what it means to the relations between the races.

(3) As a final factor in the race problem of the present day, we would mention the United States Government. Since reconstruction days, the Government has kept its hands off the Negro question. It has chosen to regard it, all of a sudden, as "a local issue," like General Hancock's tariff, belonging particularly to the South, and therefore for the South to work out on its own terms. The open and shameless nullification of the National Constitution by state legislation, has stirred the Government at Washington to no protest or interference. Education, which has no political implications of any kind, has been left severely alone. Even lynching has been allowed to go on for a generation or more, without the slightest official notice or action on the part of administrative officials; the same government which was so profoundly outraged by German atrocities in Belgium, remained absolutely unmoved in the face of American atrocities right here at home in Georgia, Mississippi and Arkansas.

But now a new development has come into the situation. The Negro question no longer pertains only to the South, for members of the black race are now widely distributed in all parts of the Union. The horrors of Negro oppression are no longer confined to the area south of the Mason and Dixon's line; some of the worst atrocities have been perpetrated in Pennsylvania, North Dakota and Illinois, and the worst race riots have been in Chicago and East St. Louis. Furthermore, the Negro terror, thus so widely distributed throughout the country, is now reaching such proportions as to rivet the attention of the world. What we

have here today, at least in the eyes of mankind in general, is a typical American phenomenon. The butchering of Negroes is taking on the aspects of a national sport, like bull-fighting in Spain and man-hunting in Ireland. When blood-lust runs riot in Tulsa, it is not Tulsa itself or even Oklahoma that is concerned, but the United States as a whole. The shame of that beastly outbreak is a national shame. Americans everywhere are held up to the contempt and execration of humanity.

This means, of course, that the policy of the Government since Hayes's day must be radically and promptly changed. Disfranchisement, peonage, "Jim Crow" cars, lynching, race rioting, these belong not to the South but to us all. They are national crimes, and call therefore for the action of the national Government. It is recognition of this fact, undoubtedly, which led President Harding to speak as he did in his message to Congress, and induced Senator McCormick to introduce his bill providing for an official investigation by a national commission, of the whole problem. It is some slight comfort to believe that the Tulsa atrocities will at least accomplish the good of speeding the passage of this bill in both houses of Congress.

Such are some of the new factors in the Negro problem today. The presence of these new factors means *a new problem.* And yet new as this problem is today, how old it is as well! At bottom, when all contemporaneous phases of development are forgotten, it is only the old, old problem of human brotherhood. Here today, as in the past, are our "brethren." When are we going to do them justice, and give them love?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

MEMORIES.

WALL STREET—NOON HOUR.

There is a noise, and then the crowded herd
Of noontime workers flow into the street,
My soul, bewildered and without retreat,
Closes its wings, and shrinks a frightened bird!

Oh, I have known a peace, once I have known
The joy that could have touched a heart of stone,
The heart of holy Russia beating still,
Over a snow cold steppe, and on a hill
One day in Kiev I heard a great church bell
Crying a strange farewell.

And once in a great field, the reapers mowing
Barley and wheat, I saw a great light growing,
Over the weary bowed head of each reaper
When growing sweeter, stranger, ever deeper,
From the long waters sorrowfully strong
Came the last echoes of the River Song!

Here in this alien crowd I walk apart
Clasping remembered beauty to my heart!

—*Marya Zaturensky.*

In The New York Evening Post.

CONTRIBUTED

The Sociology of Peace

By Dr. Ellsworth Faris, Professor of Sociology University of Chicago

Among the many principles of human nature which are appealed to by those who regard war as inevitable, two require special examination—namely, the instinct of mob imitation and the instinct of pugnacity. Militarist writers and apologists for war have used these principles in ways that are familiar to every reader of our contemporary literature. It is the purpose of this article to analyze these two so-called principles of human nature further, and in addition to attempt an examination of the pacifist position, which regards nationalism as an expression of human selfishness and therefore a stage to be overcome, followed by a brief word regarding the causes of war.

The classic statement of the theory of mob psychology was made by the writers of the French school, of whom the best known are Tarde and Le Bon. It is fair to say that whatever may be the merits of their position, it was arrived at as a result of reflections upon and interpretations of the French Revolution, a study which convinced them as well as many others of the hopelessness and futility of popular government. Mankind is thought of as divisible into two types or classes—the gifted, who are few in number and have the mysterious power of prestige and leadership, on the one hand; on the other hand, the great masses of men who imitate but do not originate. This point of view assumes imitation as a primary instinct, and the result of suggestion. Suggestion is the cause; imitation the effect. Thoughts, feelings and movements are communicated from one to the other in a direct and immediate fashion, and by a sort of contagious wave of feeling, sweep over a crowd, or a group of ideas will be carried through the land; and all this without any rational process.

And so it comes to pass that emotions, which are more powerful than thoughts, make all men captive; and this is held to explain wars and to make futile any effort to avoid them. For, it is said, your quiet peace-loving artisan or agriculturalist is helpless when war breaks out, and is swept along by tides of feeling which he can in no sense control.

If this theory be true, the wise thing to do would be to take away from the people the power to make decisions in government, and the whole of the political process would involve the discovery of great men, and the putting of them in control of affairs. Unfortunately, it is too late to suggest this. For better or for worse, the people are here, and universal suffrage has given them the right and the power to make their decisions felt; for better or for worse, their wishes are embodied in laws; and therefore, since they are subject to mob forces and the crowd mind, it is forever impossible to prevent war. The wise thing is to recognize conflicts as inevitable, and to prepare for future wars by building up strong armaments.

The critics of this point of view, most of whom are American psychologists, were not slow to point out the difficulties involved in it, for imitation as the

direct response which is a reproduction of a stimulus, is very difficult to make out. Men are swept away at times when in a mob, but they are probably only so swept away when the mob arouses impulses already present in them. Human nature consists of impulses and tendencies, and these are called out by situations, including mob situations, but no tendencies can be called out which were not present before the excitement began. This is a very important point. The failure to realize it has caused much confusion. The anger of a mob does not communicate itself directly to another man. If he become angry, it is because there was some resentment sleeping within him. A mob may therefore be held to release tendencies, but never to create them.

The writer of this article has lived among negroes for many years; he knows something of their possibilities and of their limitations. He sympathizes with their problems, and wishes he knew more about how to solve them. He has great respect for human nature as such, and confidently hopes to see them progress. He feels no hesitancy in saying that no mob, however fierce, could possibly make him attack a negro or want to burn his house, or perpetrate any cruelty upon him, for he recognizes no element of hostility whatever within himself against them. There are causes which he hates; there are animosities which he feels; and the hatred and animosity can be released in a mob, but no mob can release an attitude of hostility which is not there.

And the moral of this is that attitudes of friendliness and hostility are controllable. Race prejudice is a tragic fact, but it is never inborn nor permanent. Children acquire such prejudices; adults often acquire new ones, and as often outgrow old ones. Theoretically, it would be quite possible so to train our youth that no mob, nor any wave of mob mind could ever sweep us into a war with Mexico or Japan, because the national attitudes on which mobs work would be wanting.

The present view of the American critics of the French school of mob psychology would lead us to discredit entirely any theory which would make us helpless in the face of mob action. It is true that we often are helpless. It is true that we have often been swept along by a wave of feeling. It is true that we do much mob thinking, but the mob is limited in its power to the habits of thinking, feeling or action which we have acquired before.

This view is proved by a study of hypnotism. In hypnotism the subject is suggestible to an extreme degree. Tell the hypnotized person that his handkerchief is beefsteak, and he will try to eat it; but tell an unmusical hypnotized person to play a sonata, and you will get no music. Suggestions can only operate on already acquired habits; and mob psychology is a particular case of suggestion.

Therefore, if we could in our schools, homes, churches, and our other institutions give to our youth attitudes of good will and friendliness toward the other nations, and races, it would be possible to make them entirely independent of any work that any mob could do.

But here enters the second question. Certain attitudes are held by some psychologists to be a part of the inheritance of every normal human being. A taste for caviar may be acquired, but there are certain basic instincts which we neither learn nor can escape. It is not easy to agree on how many of these instincts there are, but one of them is held to be the fighting instinct. According to a widespread convicition, every normal human being—at least every normal male—has in him an ineradicable tendency to fight. You may overlay this tendency with a thin coating of refinement; you may cover it with a slight "veneer of civilization"; but beneath and very near the surface is this primal beastlike combative nature which must be satisfied in some way, and which is the rock on which so many theories have split.

Undoubtedly there was a primitive man, but what he was like is not so easy to say. In the caves we find a few flint weapons and some bones from ancient feasts, with here and there a fragment from a human skeleton; but as to how they lived, and what they did, we have nothing but our imaginations. Primitive man is a hypothesis. No person now living ever saw one; nor did any man of the ancient times, who wrote a book, live early enough to observe one.

Indeed, it is very interesting to contrast the different types of primitive man which have been invented by theorists. The primitive man of Rousseau, for example, was gentle, peaceable, mild and idyllic. For Rousseau was explaining why it was that the institutions of society had done so much harm to human nature. The present picture of primitive man, who is thought of as a fierce and cruel savage, is not a result of scientific investigation of primitive people. On the contrary, our views of primitive man arise out of the necessity of explaining the aberrations, cruelties and anti-social tendencies of our own contemporaries. And some men, like Carleton Parker, insist that primitive man was wild and cruel and barbarous; that the fighting instinct is something that comes with our own nature; that it is born in all of us, and can no more be controlled than the color of our eyes, or the tendency to blush, or cough, or sneeze. Therefore, they say, if you do away with war, you must do away with human nature itself, for to be human is to be a fighter.

On the other hand, it can be contended that most of us live all our lives without ever fighting. There are many of these instincts which never seem to be working in particular individuals. Indeed, and this is the most important fact, no human instinct is ever the result of direct observation, for instincts are hypotheses to explain and simplify complex habits. Save in the new-born infant, it is impossible ever to observe an instinct not modified by experience. Tendencies we have, habits we have, but tendencies and habits are almost indefinitely modifiable.

Consider the food habits of different peoples, the Eskimos living entirely on meat, all of it raw; the Hindoo subsisting exclusively on vegetables; and our own mixed diet. It is clear that we have food habits that are plastic and modifiable, and have very little in common with the instincts of the animals, which are relatively invariable.

Or consider this situation. The women of the Ibibio tribe in Nigeria never dare to eat of the double plantain or double yam for fear of bearing twins, the most dreadful thing that can happen to anyone. When twins are born, one of them is considered to be the offspring of no earthly father, but the child of some wandering demon. The twins are always

killed, and the mother can escape death only by a year of exile and purification in an isolated hut. Not a thousand miles from this place, in the equatorial Congo, the women look upon twins as the greatest blessing. The mother of twins is given a title of honor for her whole lifetime, and is highly esteemed for her good fortune. Now, if either of these customs were universal, it would be possible to make an argument in favor of a twin-loving, or twin-abhorring instinct as the case might be. But both customs being existent, something other than instinct must be involved to explain this.

Or take the so-called instinct of fear. Most of the text books on psychology describe the instinctive fear of little children at the sight of fur. The researches of Watson have recently shown that infants are never afraid of fur or indeed of any visual experience. If, however, a loud sound causes fright in a child, at the same time that a fur coat is shown the child, he will be afraid ever afterward of the fur coat. This conditioning reaction is a very important factor in understanding human behavior and makes necessary a very different conception of instincts.

The dependence upon a fighting instinct that explains war and minor combats seems to evidence a certain degree of identity between men and animals which does not stand critical examination. The animals indeed are driven by their instincts, and man has impulsive tendencies, which seem at first sight to be like the instincts of the animal. Upon closer examination, however, these instincts appear to be so much more modifiable and plastic that their fixed character is entirely altered. Dogs bark about the same, wherever they are. The same variety of dogs can be distinguished by the quality of the voice—but the speech of human beings is very different. Human languages are the result of a more complicated type of behavior than mere instincts.

For the human being has in addition to impulses, images, and when the impulse has an image, it becomes a desire or a wish—and desires or wishes in this sense are peculiar to human nature. The soldiers who joined the army before the act of conscription, did not necessarily do so on account of the drive of their instinct of fighting; some of them had a kind of love of romance; some joined because others were joining; some joined through a sense of duty; some through a sense of fear. But those who joined because they wanted to join, were not obeying a blind instinct, for in the human being the instinct is no longer blind.

Sociologists are coming to regard the important data of human nature as desires and wishes instead of instincts. But desires and wishes are social in their nature. No desires are wholly individual. The raw material of impulse is always molded by the social definition, and the result is a type of motivation different essentially from bare instincts.

We are not therefore helpless in the face of the fighting instinct or any other. For human nature is the product of social experience. There are whole tribes of people who have never fought—who do not even possess weapons. Whether fighting is good or bad, is not here the question. The question is whether, to be human, we must fight. And the answer is an uncategorical negative.

Neither a tendency to mob action nor the inherited instinct to fight are sufficiently stubborn facts to make us feel helpless in our effort to avoid future wars. But what of the question of nationalism? According to many thinkers, and among them are some of the leaders of liberal thought, nationalism is a stage of progress which we should expect to outgrow. For national rivalries are selfish and are breeders of war and conflict. We are told by these people that the way out is the abolition of national boundaries, and the adoption of internationalism or cosmopolitanism. Selfishness produces fighting—selfishness causes wars—unselfishness, regard for others, devotion to the general welfare; in short, cosmic altruism is the only solution for our troubled world.

It seems to the writer that this also implies a certain confusion. The theory of self denial has been very thoroughly treated by Professor Dewey in his Ethics, and has been shown to be a fallacious point of view. For it identifies the self with one of its factors. He who contends that it is our highest duty to deny ourselves, fails to realize that many of our aspirations may be praiseworthy. If we deny the good in us, we do harm. If we deny the bad within ourselves, it is well, but it is not well to call the bad part our real self.

And so in the matter of nations contending with other nations, it is not necessary that we exhort men to seek the interests of the races of the world, and to deny the interests of America. For this is to assume that the interests of America and of the rest of the nations conflict and clash. Properly viewed, they neither conflict nor clash. The planet has on it, and in it, riches and resources which we can make use of for the satisfaction of human wants—but in this task it is better for us all to work together.

America's interests are not separate from those of other nations. What is good for one's city, one's college, one's neighborhood is, in the long run, good for one's self. What is good for one nation, seen from the standpoint of the stars, is good for all. The way lies not in denying one's self and seeking the interests of others, but in seeking the good of both, for both are inter-related. The argument for unselfishness misses the point. Life is made up of objects which we seek, and of impulses which strive for expression—and if one has the right kind of self, he may indulge his impulses to the full; nay, it would be wrong to deny them.

Patriotism and nationalism therefore are not in themselves bad. This is not the place to set forth the benefits of national organization—but it is enough to say that the state arises in response to the needs of its members, not only needs of defence or attack, but also needs of organization, of convenience, of providing of means of communication, transportation, education and development of worthy enterprises. We may be just as patriotic as we will, if we have the right conception of our country, and if our country can be made to express its true and proper mission.

Finally, a brief word as to the causes of war. It is impossible to state this completely, for all the universe from the beginning has conspired to produce the minutest variations in the world about us. No grain of sand on the seashore lies there without the co-operation of a thousand causes operating through a million years.

Stated in this way, the inquiry into the causes of war is insoluble. But there is a narrower meaning in which we can with profit discuss the causes of war. In this sense, a cause is one element which, by isolating, we can control. The causes of war are very complex. Sometimes economic rivalry is the cause. Not that everyone gains money, but that some powerful interests are enriched by war, or expect to be. Wars are also caused by aspirations, or sentimental considerations, emotional aversions, and loyalties, such as we see in Ireland at the present time. But the most frequent is a sort of negative cause, the breakdown of diplomatic machinery. It is due oftentimes to the failure of the men involved to find a solution of a difficult problem.

War will not be prevented by good will. While there will never be enough love in the world, men are not ruled by love. The people who control are not always those who love, but rather those who have skill in controlling. Dewey somewhere says that when two teamsters have locked wheels on a narrow road, the wisest procedure would not be to exhort them to love each other as brothers, but rather to install a traffic cop and teach them the rule of the road.

We do not have to wait until we all love each other in order to organize ourselves. Good will and love and religion are not going to prevent war. Religion may indeed cause war, in the sense that it provides the enthusiasm and stimulus to a hostile impulse. Ideals and religion we need and must have. But the most profitable object of our attention now should be the search for skill—for intelligent devices to control the attitudes of our fellow countrymen, and all those in other lands against whom there is possibility of our being arrayed in conflict.

ETERNAL SPRING.

How can I die, my God, and never live another spring?
  I know not what my after life may be,
But in it all there cannot be a thing
  So glorious, so wonderful to see
  As pale pink snow on ancient apple tree.

In all eternity I know there cannot be so sweet
  A fragrance as the lilac wet with rain,
Or tender grasses crushed beneath my feet.
  Such odor brings a sudden thrill of pain,—
  To think "In death it will not live again!"

So if, my God, you would have me find joy in dreaming death,
  Would have me to your feet my worship bring,
Would have me praise you with my first new breath,
  Would have my soul rise free on joyous wing—
  Through all eternity, let there be spring!

LILY O. WILSON.

It has been shown that the chief value and virtue of money consists in its having power over human beings; that without this power large material possessions are useless, and to any person possessing such power, comparatively unnecessary. But power over human beings is attainable by other means than by money. . . . The money power is always imperfect and doubtful; there are many things that cannot be retained by it. Many joys may be given to men which cannot be bought for gold, and many fidelities found in them which cannot be rewarded by it.

—*John Ruskin.*

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

IV.

JOSEPH MAZZINI.

Giuseppe Mazzini, 1805-1872, was an incarnation of the spirit of revolt. A graduate of the University of Genoa, his native city, an eager student, deeply interested in religion, greatly attracted to a life of culture and literature, he began as a youth to desire the unity of Italy as a republic. As a result most of his life was spent as an exile, at Marseilles, Switzerland, and for twenty years in England. He organized several revolutionary societies, made numerous attempts at bringing revolution to Italy, for some six months was at the head of the Roman Republic, became the terror of every government in continental Europe, his name caused kings and statesmen to tremble at its mention, and he fought on until he saw Italy united, though not as a republic.

Revolutionist as he was, though all his attempts at freeing Italy from the oppressions of Austria and France were abortive, he was admired by many persons competent to judge of his high qualities as man and patriot. Thomas Carlyle wrote that Mazzini was a man of genius, of sterling veracity, humanity, and nobleness of mind, one of those rare men worthy to be called martyr souls. William Lloyd Garrison was impressed with the brilliancy of Mazzini's mind, the modesty of his deportment, the urbanity of his spirit, and the fascination of his conversational powers. Moscheles said that Mazzini could penetrate into some innermost recess of your conscience and kindle a spark where all had been darkness. He could rouse in you an eager desire to go forth to overthrow the whole wretched fabric of falsehoods holding mankind in bondage. Benjamin Jowett saw in Mazzini a very noble character and a genius beyond that of the ordinary statesman. W. J. Linton said that Mazzini's eyes were lit up with a power that was almost overwhelming, and all who wrote of him described his eyes as most remarkable in their penetration and their gift of fascination. Linton also speaks of his foresight, his thorough unselfishness, his absolute integrity, and his never-failing readiness to devote all his powers and hopes and ideas to the realization of that first practical step to the carrying out his life's aims, his country's freedom and nationality, which he sought by every honorable endeavor.

Mazzini regarded religion as the very foundation of every phase of man's activity. It creates the state, as it brings into being all that is truly human. He had little or no interest in theology; and he rejected the miraculous and supernatural. Reared in the Roman Catholic church, he was of the opinion that it was in a condition of collapse and failure. He believed that it would be replaced by a newer and higher religion, one more in accordance with the needs of mankind. Rejecting Christianity, he accepted the teachings of Christ, and saw in him the world's greatest spiritual leader. The new religion he believed was in the process of development will have as its fundamental idea that of humanity as a collective being. Its theater of expression will be man's present existence, and its chief purpose will be that of making the life man lives now noble and beautiful. In the collective life of humanity Mazzini saw what he designated as the "Infant

of God," the child of the divine, God's chief interest. The creed he accepted is the universal tradition of man's progressive development, the true revelation of God to man. The moral elevation of man, his continued ethical progress, his spiritual perfection, were what Mazzini regarded as the large aims of the new religion. What he desired was a brotherhood of all men, a fellowship in love and peace of all who live the life of earth.

Growing out of religion are nationality and the state. He saw in language and literature the living traditions of a people, expressing and embodying all its past, the forces which create a nation, though he did not ignore geographical and economic operative causes. He was thoroughly a democrat, and that was why he had an eager desire for the securing of a republic in Italy. He believed in the people, sympathized most keenly with the workers, championed their cause whenever opportunity offered, and fellowshipped with them as if he had been born in their ranks. To him the voice of the people was actually the voice of God.

Although all his life Mazzini was an active revolutionist, leading more than one struggle to a bloody issue, he was a lover of peace and desired that all men and nations should live together in harmony and good-will. But he wrote of the necessary conditions of peace in these words: "When you have substituted justice for tyranny, truth for falsehood, duty for selfish interests, the republic for monarchy, then you will have peace." The experiences of the last few years, however, have not brought a guarantee that a republic is an assured means of securing the peace which Mazzini desired.

Mazzini organized a Young Italy, then a Young Europe, and finally a Young Switzerland, with the idea that the new political life of the future, as well as the present, must be secured by those who are youthful, enthusiastic, and capable of vigorous action and self-sacrifice. He would unite Italian or Swiss youth in behalf of freedom and nationality, and the patriots of all Europe in order that all the nations might be federated together in behalf of unity and co-operation in the interests of mankind. In securing liberty, equity, and fraternity for all peoples, he accepted the principles of "one sole God; one only ruler, his law; and one only interpreter of that law, humanity."

The revolutions of the past, thought Mazzini, have been based on a demand for rights, for individual self-assertion; and they have failed. Rights are selfish and misleading; and they need to be replaced by duties, which lead to unity, fellowship and co-operation. Rights are analytic and divisive; but duties are synthetic and co-operative in their very nature. The one magnifies the individual, and the other gives power to society. The one causes hatreds and wars, the other brings fellowship and peace.

In his political, as in his ethical and religious theorizing, Mazzini gave great emphasis to what he called the principle of association. That principle was none other than what we know today as co-operation. To him association meant more than co-operative production and distribution. This word association designated all forms of fellowship, working together, combined effort of whatever kind, collective activity in the largest possible degree. He would apply it not only to processes of manufacturing and distribution, but he saw in it the true significance of art, literature, culture, and civilization. Life itself is an associative process, and there can be no civilization without its aid. In fact, progress, culture, ethical evolution are results secured only by means of human association. Co-operation is the law of all life.

Not only is association necessary to human progress, but it can never be made effective without liberty. Men must be free in order that they may associate. Free men can co-operate in the spirit of fellowship; but not so those who are in any manner or degree enslaved. The desire for freedom made Mazzini a democrat, and it caused him to devote his life to the freeing of Italy. It was not in a mere spirit of patriotism that he sought all his life for the liberation of his country, but as zealously he sought for that of Poland, Hungary and all Europe. Indeed, he made no limit of nationality, for to him the freedom of mankind seemed essential to a full measure of liberty for Italy or any other country. Devoted as he was to Italy as his motherland, he asked for nothing for that country which he did not desire for the meanest and most degraded people, wherever it might be.

Another principle had a great appeal for Mazzini, that of universal education. He saw in knowledge a mighty spiritual power, a power without which liberty and association could not be effective. It was not mere information, a knowledge of facts only, which appealed to Mazzini, as making education a mighty power. What he desired for the people was training, culture, wisdom, mastery of self and the world. Not what is didactic, academic, scientific in details, was the wisdom Mazzini sought; but the grasp of principles, breadth and depth of thought, comprehension of life in its totality of significance, and trust in the forces which are ethical and spiritual.

When Mazzini thought of the state it was as a family, a fellowship, a company of united and harmonious persons. "Association," he said, "multiplies your strength a hundred fold; it makes the ideas and progress of other men your own; it raises, betters, hallows your nature with the affections of the human family, and its growing sense of unity." Therefore it could not be material interests only, those of industry and economic concerns, which Mazzini saw at the basis of the state; but those interests which bind men together, bring them to the aid of each other, and attracts them to live as brothers.

Mazzini could not think of the individual as standing alone, as complete in himself, as having the higher sources of his life in his own nature. His idea of the collective being of mankind led him to emphasize the interrelations of men with each other, their mutual dependence. Harmony among men can only come when both the individual and society are regarded as one and inseparable, both held to be sacred. "We want to balance the operations of liberty and association in a noble harmony." With Mazzini education, conceived as equipment for liberty and co-operation, gives the conditions of human progress, enlarges the scope of the soul's activities, amplifies individual power for the reason that it gives the individual the strength of the collective life of the race—making the state the means by which men associate their lives in behalf of everything that is truly human.

His emphasis on association did not lead Mazzini to find in communism, anarchism, or socialism such theo-

ries as he could accept. To him socialism was too materialistic, too much concerned with the merely external interests of man, and too indifferent to what is ethical and religious. He condemned it in severest terms, though he associated with many socialists, and actively sought the welfare of the working class. We should say today that his emphasis was on what is psychological, rather than on the industrial and economic. He had regard to geographical conceptions in his theory of the state; but what was of far more importance to him were the cultural conditions which have been gradually developing in the history of mankind, and have become great traditions of ethical purpose, religious idealism, and intellectual wisdom. The life of every individual is shaped by these spiritual forces, this transmitted culture, this life of the past, gathered to a focus in the present. That life has been gradually shaped by all the men and races who have ever lived, and, under God, the spiritual forces produced by means of the experiences of all the peoples of the world, gives meaning and direction, shape and purpose, to our individual lives. This is the creative power that has made man what he is; and it is developing as the ages pass on, being the true revelation of God to man.

We may query why a man of such refined culture, such keen ethical perceptions, such deep religious convictions, could become a revolutionist, and the terror of all governing classes in Europe. It was his conviction that only in this manner could Italy, Poland, and the whole of Europe become free and united. He may have been mistaken, and doubtless was led in a false direction, but his purpose was of the noblest. Perhaps revolution was the only way to what he desired.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

A Book a Week

Mary Badollet Powell Memorial

MISS LULU BETT. By Zona Gale. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

"Well," said George William, "I don't care for it."

His wife, Mildred, called Millie, was not surprised; as a matter of fact she agreed with him—it was a habit with her, agreeing.

"It pretends to be true to life," her husband continued. "But the point is, it's too sentimental. The author's prejudiced, she likes her heroine too much, she isn't fair to the others, she doesn't see Lulu's faults. Now it was silly for Lulu to buy those tulips when she was dependent on her brother-in-law that way. You see that, don't you, Millie?"

"Why, sure," said Millie dutifully. But Aunt Gloria, sitting in her corner, dissented.

"I don't see it at all," she declared, "because it was her own money, wasn't it? Her brother didn't give it to her, did he? And, anyway, it wasn't as if she did that every day; she only did it *once.*"

"Once was enough," George William asserted in his firmest manner, "because it showed her nature, doing that, under the circumstances. If she had come to her brother-in-law and said, 'Look here, Herbert, I've got a quarter and I want to buy some tulips, if you don't mind,' that would have been different. Don't you think so, Millie?"

"Why, of course," his wife murmured. "Naturally."

"Because then Herbert would have said, 'Why, Lulu, you do just as you please with your own money,' and everything would have been all right."

Aunt Gloria sniffed perceptibly. "I don't see it," she said. "It was her money, and she didn't have to ask any man what she could do with it. Anyway, if Herbert would have said it was all right, she had a right to presume it would be all right. I think Herbert was selfish, that's what I think."

The truth about Aunt Gloria was that she had *money!* Eight hundred dollars! In a savings bank. George Williams expected she would leave it to them when she died. Hence they never argued with her as they did with others. They deferred to her—because she had money.

But George William was stubborn this particular evening, and he was determined that neither Aunt Gloria nor his wife should be influenced by anything they might have learned from "Lulu Bett." So he stood his ground and made the best answer he could invent. As usual, he imagined himself a magistrate, or, at least, a prosecuting attorney; he talked with one finger in the air.

"Now let's go back a bit," he began. "I admit the money she spent for the flowers was her own money. But if she had been out in the world, working for herself, shifting for herself as I *should* say, she wouldn't have been likely to have any money, would she? I mean money of her own, to do with as she pleased."

"She might have had more than a quarter, I should think," said Aunt Gloria, bitterly.

"I don't think she'd have had a cent," declared George William. "She'd more than likely have been in the poorhouse, as inefficient as she was. Think of her, running out in the street in an old wrapper, disgraceing everybody and everything."

"Of course," said Millie, but George William took no notice.

"She's *weak,* Aunt Gloria," he continued impressively, "that's what she is. There's lots of people like that, just too weak to protect themselves properly, and they have to rely on others, which is hard for the others."

"Hard for them, too, I guess," Aunt Gloria replied.

"I think they have it very easy under the circumstances," he said, "and they ought to be grateful to those that help them. What would they do if they were thrown out in the gutter? I suppose they'd die there, too weak to get up on their own feet."

"Oh, I don't know," the old lady declared. "They might learn self-reliance."

"That kind never learn aything," George William insisted. "They're too weak."

"Lulu learned, didn't she?" asked Aunt Gloria.

"What did she learn?"

"She found out she was useful to her relatives."

"Oh," George William sneered, "I guess they were very glad to get rid of her, a woman like that."

"Well, I didn't see anything about them celebrating the great event," Aunt Gloria said. "I think they were really very sorry to see her go, though they'd never admit it. They made use of her while she was with them, all right. She was a good hand at housekeepin' and bringin' up children and everything like that. Very convenient in a man's house, I'd say. A servant workin' for nothin' and with more than a servant's responsibility. Look what would have happened to their

daughter if Lulu hadn't been on the scene; she'd maybe have married that stupid boy and been unhappy all her life."

"I don't think Lulu could set up as an expert on marriage," George William retorted. "She did all the crazy things a woman can do, I should think. Ran off with one man and found out he was already married, then grabbed another fellow that was really looking for a younger woman than what Lulu was. She made all the mistakes on the calendar—which was all because she was weak."

"Because she made them mistakes she could judge about other people and what they did, couldn't she?" Aunt Gloria replied. "Making mistakes is one way of learnin' things, ain't it? Well, she learned all right, and don't you forget it. She learned what men was, incidentally, and how you can't ever trust them."

"Well, she was always crazy about men, wasn't she? Didn't she run after them all the time? Didn't she lead that married fellow, Herbert's brother, on? Didn't she go after that piano salesman hard enough?"

"She was *not* crazy about men. She was just normal. She was lonely, and she wanted friends, and didn't have any in that house." Aunt Gloria was in fighting form. "That's why when Herbert's worthless brother came she was glad, especially when he showed her he cared about her, which was natural enough. She didn't know what kind of creature he was. But when he did what he did to her, she didn't let it ruin her life for her; she went with the piano man, and he loved her. What would you want her to do? Go in a convent, I suppose, or an old lady's home."

"She ought to have stayed right where she was and recognized the fact that bein' weak as she was she wasn't fit to battle for herself and was only good at doin' little things for people who were better able to look after her than she was herself. Everybody ought to learn their place in life and stay in it, doing whatever Providence calls them to do as cheerfully and quietly as possible, under the circumstances."

"She wasn't weak," declared Aunt Gloria. "She was stronger than they were that thought her weak. She kept their house going for them, did all their dirty work, slaved for them, never got anything but insults for it, and then after one of their kind had broken her heart for her, she went right out, in spite of everything, and saved their girl from the same kind of experience, never thinkin' of herself at all, but only of that girl, who *was* weak and silly, just like her parents was. And what reward did she get? Did they understand her any better? Not much. They knew in their consciences what she had done for them, but they never let on they knew. They were just gettin' ready to shove her back into her misery again when she came to her senses and left them. Talk about people being weak! What could be weaker than Ninian, or for that matter Herbert himself, Lulu's brother-in-law? They're just worms, that's all, just low, crawling worms. It makes me mad to read about them!"

"Aunt Gloria," said George William, "you don't understand. You haven't studied life, like I have. Now, in the office I see all kinds of people, weak people and strong people. Some are made to command and some to obey. Some are like Lulu Bett, pretty fair workers in their own field, but too weak to really take care of themselves. , Once in a while, I'll admit, they do somethin' especially good, like Lulu did when she let her niece profit by her own experience, but for the most part they're too weak. They have to take orders from those who are naturally fitted to command. It's just a matter of nature. People are what they are, because that's the way God made them. And the best any of us can do is just to make the most of what our duty calls us to. Lulu Bett was never meant to be a strong, understandin' woman, self-reliant and all that. She was made weak, and that's all there is to it. So the story is weak, because the author likes Lulu and won't tell what is really wrong with her, which is just what I say it is."

Aunt Gloria rose from her chair and moved slowly across the parlor to the piano where the book lay. She put forth one small, thin hand and took up the little volume, gently and kindly.

"Well," she said, "I can't argue like you can, George, because I suppose I don't have your kind of brains. But I wish I could have read 'Lulu Bett' thirty-five years ago. Life might have been a different story for me if I'd have had somebody explain to me what this book did when I read it. It may be, as you say, that some are weak and some are strong, and that some are meant to lean and others to support. But it seems to me that those that you call weak is really the strongest, because they're gentle and kind and unselfish. The strong take, that's what they always do, but the weak give; and the Bible says giving is better than taking, and I believe it. Lulu Bett wasn't a fighter, till they roused her up to defend herself. Even then she wasn't no lioness. She was *too* kind, *too* gentle, I suppose. She let people walk all over her, which was wrong for them to do and wrong for her to allow. She wasn't selfish enough, she let people hurt her, and she ought not to have done that. But after all it's a lot more decent to be unselfish than to be the other way, like most people are. Anyway those that profited by her generosity ought never to have treated her badly because she was generous. If she was weak, as you say she was, they were wrong to take advantage of her. So her weakness, as you call it, touches me a lot more than their strength. I believe in God and in God's justice, and I'd rather be Lulu Bett at the bar of judgment than Herbert Deacon or his wife, because I'm sure God would see it as I do."

Aunt Gloria's manner admitted no possibility of retort. She clasped the book to her breast and went out. They heard her climb the creaky stairs and close the door of her little room on the floor above. When the last sound died away, George William turned to his wife and said:

"Now that's the last time we'll discuss that confounded book. I won't have it, I say. It's very aggravating."

"I should say so," said Millie. "You're right, George."

George William went away to a meeting of his lodge and his wife took up her darning. Three hours later the man returned and found her asleep in her chair. They blew out the lamp and retired to their room. As they passed down the hall, George William pointed dumbly at a little bar of light under

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE QUAKERS IN GERMANY.

The American Friends Service Committee announced recently on the first anniversary of American child feeding in Central Europe, that it has served one hundred million meals to hungry German children in 875 cities, villages and towns throughout the republic. These meals, which have been made possible by the gifts of the American people, have been given only to children under fourteen years of age, and to nursing and expectant mothers, who have been examined and certified in every case by physicians, and who are either in Class 4; *i. e.*, those who show actual evidences of retarded growth or disease, superinduced by prolonged undernourishment, or who are in Class 3; *i. e.*, those who are in imminent danger of sickness or permanent disability from the same cause. It is not generally known in the United States that Mr. Herbert Hoover, who originally suggested to the American Society of Friends shortly after the Armistice of November 11, 1918, that their service committee undertake extensive relief work in Central Europe, similar to the work which Mr. Hoover and his assistants had carried on with so much success in Belgium in the earlier years of war, has made large contributions of food and money to that Committee from the resources of the American Relief Administration. It is also not a matter of common knowledge that Mr. Hoover has turned over all American relief work in Germany to the American Friends Service Committee, with the single exception of the food-draft system of the American Relief Administration, by which gifts of food from Americans are delivered to specific individuals in Germany upon the purchase of food-drafts in America to the amount of $5, $10 and $25. All contributions from Americans to the recent $33,000,000 drive of the European Children's Relief Fund Committee, which were specifically intended and marked for distribution in Germany will, therefore, be turned over to the American Friends Service Committee by the Hoover Committee, and all further contributions to the child feeding in Germany should be sent, therefore, directly to the American Friends Service Committee, whose headquarters are at 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia.

When, under the authority of the Paris Peace Conference, Mr. Herbert Hoover was made virtual food dictator of the world, he proceeded to ration and sell necessary foodstuffs to almost all of the countries of Europe, and he required payment in gold from the government of Germany, while accepting promisory notes from the governments of most of the allied countries. Upon this transaction with the German government which continued for many months, a considerable profit was realized and when, in November, 1920, the destitution and widespread suffering, particularly among the children of Central Europe, was brought to Mr. Hoover's attention, he gave to the Quaker organization a large part of the sum, amounting to more than a million dollars, on condition that it be disbursed by them in the form of food to the starving children of Germany. The money was thus returned to the people from whom it had come.

Upon the strength of this gift, and the proportion which will accrue to the American Friends Service Committee from the recent successful $33,000,000 drive in the United States, the Friends Service Committee will shortly be able to increase the extent of its child feeding in Germany by some two hundred thousand meals a day, and to carry the Quakerspeisung (as the American food is called all over Germany) and the message of reconciliation and peace, which goes with it into several dozens villages and towns which it has not been possible heretofore to reach. It will also be possible now for the first time to extend the ages of those who receive the Quakerspeisung, to include about 10,000 children and youths from fourteen to eighteen years—who will be selected on the same basis of medical examination and certification as the others, from among the attendants at continuation schools.

A valuable gift from the American Red Cross of 500,000 yards of flannel cloth has recently arrived at Hamburg, supplementing a trainload of clothing which was received from the same source at Frankfurt several weeks ago, and these large contributions, which evidence a new and gratifying readiness on the part of the American Red Cross to extend its relief in the spirit of its motto of "Neutrality" to the suffering people in former enemy countries, will be distributed by the American Friends Service Committee with the co-operation of local German committees, and will go far to relieve the wretchedness of many thousands of children to whom cold is an even deadlier enemy than famine.

Quaker food is now going to the children in all four of the occupied areas of Germany. In the case of the Cologne district the Quakers received an urgent invitation to undertake wholesale feeding of the undernourished children within the zone by the English military command, and for the last three months approximately 19,000 children have been fed there every day. Six thousand are fed daily in the area around Coblenz, occupied by the American troops.

Striking evidences of the appreciation of the German people for this substantial and merciful expression of good will from abroad is seen in the quaint and sometimes beautiful drawings and poems and gifts of their own manufacture, which come to the Berlin headquarters of the organiaztion from the children throughout Germany, from isolated Koenigsberg on the Baltic, to the sleepy and hungry villages of southern Wuerttemberg and Bavaria. Testimonials of gratitude are received almost daily from local and national officials and from prominent civilians, of which the following extract from a letter from the rector of the University of Halle is typical:

(Translation)

"At the end of the semester we feel that we want to thank the Quakers once more for all their kindness to our students. It is not only that you have for three months sent us supplies, to the value of over 60,000 Marks, which has enabled us to give the students a really nourishing meal for an extraordinarily low price, but in this way you have helped us to start welfare work for students on a large scale. It is indirectly owing to you and to the encouragement given through your work that many of our professors and citizens have given considerable sums for free meals and invited individual students to their own table. Above all, it is the spirit of a love which reconciles the nations, a proof that the politicians have not been able to infect the nations through and through with the spirit of mutual hate, which shines forth from your work amongst our children and our students and unites us in grateful thanks. We are especially grateful that you are going to help us through the holidays, for it is the hardest-working and poorest of our students who stay here during the holidays.

"Finally, we beg you to continue your work also through the summer semester and that there may be no interruption in the supply of food.

"(Signed) Halle Local Committee
for Student Feeding,
"Prof. v. Dobschuetz, Rektor."

Aunt Gloria's door that testified to the fact that the old lady had not yet gone to bed. When they reached their own quarters at the other end of the corridor, George William said:

"She's still up. Readin' that book again, I suppose."

Millie agreed.

"She's gettin' old rapidly," George William continued. "Won't last much longer. An awful crank, too."

He dropped his boots heavily. "But I'll not have that book mentioned again, I warn you."

"No," said his wife.

But they feared without cause, for Aunt Gloria never spoke of "Lulu Bett" again. She kept the book under her pillow and read it over and over. But she never spoke of it.

When she died, a few months later, they found a brief testament bequeathing all her savings to an orphanage.

"How could she?" George William exclaimed when he heard the news.

No one answered his question.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

The world is organized for Righteousness, whether it looks like it or not: and God can wait.—*R. J. Campbell.*

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- -

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....